

LATEST FASHIONS

Demand

J. W. BRADLEY'S

DUPEX

ELLIPTIC

Or Double Spring

SKIRTS!

STANDARD SKIRT

OF THE FASHIONABLE WORK

LATEST NYLON BRADLEY'S

NEW FASHIONABLE

WEST, BRADLEY, & CAREY,

OF THE PATENT AND EXCLUSIVE

WAREHOUSE AND OFFICE

OF THE PATENT AND EXCLUSIVE

OF THE PATENT AND EXCLUSIVE

OF THE PATENT AND EXCLUSIVE

OF THE PATENT AND EXCLUSIVE

OF THE PATENT AND EXCLUSIVE

OF THE PATENT AND EXCLUSIVE

OF THE PATENT AND EXCLUSIVE

OF THE PATENT AND EXCLUSIVE

OF THE PATENT AND EXCLUSIVE

OF THE PATENT AND EXCLUSIVE

OF THE PATENT AND EXCLUSIVE

OF THE PATENT AND EXCLUSIVE

OF THE PATENT AND EXCLUSIVE

OF THE PATENT AND EXCLUSIVE

OF THE PATENT AND EXCLUSIVE

OF THE PATENT AND EXCLUSIVE

OF THE PATENT AND EXCLUSIVE

OF THE PATENT AND EXCLUSIVE

OF THE PATENT AND EXCLUSIVE

OF THE PATENT AND EXCLUSIVE

OF THE PATENT AND EXCLUSIVE

OF THE PATENT AND EXCLUSIVE

OF THE PATENT AND EXCLUSIVE

OF THE PATENT AND EXCLUSIVE

OF THE PATENT AND EXCLUSIVE

OF THE PATENT AND EXCLUSIVE

OF THE PATENT AND EXCLUSIVE

OF THE PATENT AND EXCLUSIVE

OF THE PATENT AND EXCLUSIVE

OF THE PATENT AND EXCLUSIVE

OF THE PATENT AND EXCLUSIVE

OF THE PATENT AND EXCLUSIVE

OF THE PATENT AND EXCLUSIVE

OF THE PATENT AND EXCLUSIVE

OF THE PATENT AND EXCLUSIVE

OF THE PATENT AND EXCLUSIVE

OF THE PATENT AND EXCLUSIVE

OF THE PATENT AND EXCLUSIVE

OF THE PATENT AND EXCLUSIVE

OF THE PATENT AND EXCLUSIVE

OF THE PATENT AND EXCLUSIVE

OF THE PATENT AND EXCLUSIVE

OF THE PATENT AND EXCLUSIVE

OF THE PATENT AND EXCLUSIVE

OF THE PATENT AND EXCLUSIVE

OF THE PATENT AND EXCLUSIVE

OF THE PATENT AND EXCLUSIVE

OF THE PATENT AND EXCLUSIVE

OF THE PATENT AND EXCLUSIVE

OF THE PATENT AND EXCLUSIVE

OF THE PATENT AND EXCLUSIVE

OF THE PATENT AND EXCLUSIVE

OF THE PATENT AND EXCLUSIVE

OF THE PATENT AND EXCLUSIVE

OF THE PATENT AND EXCLUSIVE

OF THE PATENT AND EXCLUSIVE

LOUISVILLE JOURNAL

PRENTICE, HENDERSON, & OSBORN

Green Street, between Third and Fourth

DEMOCRATIC TICKET

FOR GOVERNOR,

JOHN L. HELM,

FOR LIEUTENANT-GOVERNOR,

JNO. W. STEVENSON,

OF KENTON.

FOR ATTORNEY-GENERAL,

JOHN RODMAN,

OF FRANKLIN.

FOR AUDITOR,

D. HOWARD SMITH,

OF OWEN.

FOR COMMISSIONER OF

JAMES W. TATE,

OF FRANKLIN.

FOR REGISTER,

JAMES A. DAWSON,

OF FRANKLIN.

FOR SUPERINTENDENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION,

Z. F. SMITH,

OF BERRY.

FOR CONGRESS,

ASA P. GROVER,

OF FRANKLIN.

MONDAY, MARCH 11, 1867.

This passage is from the late

address of the Committee of the so-called

Union Democracy of Kentucky.

The address is signed by John H. Harney and

others.

We know that there is a large majority

of the people of Kentucky who have no

genuine sympathy with either of the

extreme parties; who love the Union, who

never once faltered in the hour of

the conflict, and who, while many

things were done by the Government

which they could not approve, still main-

tained a steadfast hope for the triumph of

the Federal arms.

We rather think that our neighbor must

have felt a little mean in endorsing that

in the darkest hours of the conflict, he

on the pretext of the "things done by the

Government," suddenly struck off from

the war-party and voted violently for the

carrying the war on. There were none in

this State, who, according to their ability,

did more against the prosecution of the

war than he. From the day of his de-

parture from extreme radicalism to the

anti-war party, there was not a Union

victory that called from him the slightest

expression of joy, not a Confederate

victory for which he uttered the least re-

gret.

It was not, according to our recollection,

that the Democratic returns here, that the

Democratic indicated even the faintest dis-

approbation of the course of the confeder-

ate aiders and sympathizers in Ken-

tucky. We opposed the rebellion from its

beginning to its end. The Democrat was

for two years a radical fighter for it, then

in the darkest hours of the conflict a

fighter for two years against it, and now

joins in an address saying that its present

policy, "even in the darkest hours of the

The Journal says of its new party and

convention:

"It is true, the majority of the candi-

dates, like the majority of the party, ques-

tioned the policy of the war against the South-

ern people; but the question as to whether

such policy was right or wrong is now a

settled question, and is treated accordingly

by the party, which is organized and con-

trolled without the slightest reference to

that ghost of a point."

This, in fact, was a confession of all that

has been said of the 22d of February Con-

vention. The majority of the convention

and of the candidates are declared to

question the right of the Government to

defend its life.—Democrat.

Neighbor, this is your gloss, not our

text. We declared no such thing.

Questioning the policy of war to preserve

the "life of the Government" and ques-

tioning the right of the Government to

defend its life are two very different

things; and there was a time when the

Editor of the Democrat not only perceived

the difference, but, heedless of conse-

quences, acted upon it. And, reader,

when do you suppose that time was? In

the height of the rebellion. And with whom

do you suppose he acted? With the men

who now denounce as rebels for the

action in which he then united. It is

even so.

In the crisis of the rebellion, the

Editor of the Democrat acted with these

selfsame men in opposition to the war;

but, after the rebellion is suppressed, he

turns upon them, and, adopting the cant

as well as the sentiment of the radical

party, charges his old associates with

questioning "the right of the Government

to defend its life." Whatever may be

thought of his patriotism, none can deny

the genuineness of his assurance.

We, indeed, do not see how the Editor of

the Democrat can oppose it even "with

self-respect," for, while the rebellion was

going on, he supported what he says was

the same party, supported it upon a plat-

form hostile to that of the Northern De-

mocrat, and, after the rebellion is sup-

pressed, he turns upon the party which

he now seeks to revive, and which his de-

fection contributed ultimately to break up.—[Jour-

nal.]

What, in the deuce, does all that "he

supported," "same party, supported,"

"Northern Democracy, and supported,"

mean?—Democrat.

The Editor of the Democrat yesterday

contained an address from a committee of

the party.

The address simply one of our neigh-

bor's editorials with his name and four

or five other names added. It answers the

purpose very well; but, as we already

have over and over refuted everything in

it, we shall be pardoned if we reiterate

the performance at leisure.

This State has suffered by the late war,

but where would she have been if she had

The Journal says of its new party and

convention:

"It is true, the majority of the candi-

dates, like the majority of the party, ques-

tioned the policy of the war against the South-

ern people; but the question as to whether

such policy was right or wrong is now a

settled question, and is treated accordingly

by the party, which is organized and con-

trolled without the slightest reference to

that ghost of a point."

This, in fact, was a confession of all that

has been said of the 22d of February Con-

vention. The majority of the convention

and of the candidates are declared to

question the right of the Government to

defend its life.—Democrat.

Neighbor, this is your gloss, not our

text. We declared no such thing.

Questioning the policy of war to preserve

the "life of the Government" and ques-

tioning the right of the Government to

defend its life are two very different

things; and there was a time when the

Editor of the Democrat not only perceived

the difference, but, heedless of conse-

quences, acted upon it. And, reader,

when do you suppose that time was? In

the height of the rebellion. And with whom

do you suppose he acted? With the men

who now denounce as rebels for the

action in which he then united. It is

even so.

In the crisis of the rebellion, the

Editor of the Democrat acted with these

selfsame men in opposition to the war;

but, after the rebellion is suppressed, he

turns upon them, and, adopting the cant

as well as the sentiment of the radical

party, charges his old associates with

questioning "the right of the Government

to defend its life." Whatever may be

thought of his patriotism, none can deny

the genuineness of his assurance.

We, indeed, do not see how the Editor of

the Democrat can oppose it even "with

self-respect," for, while the rebellion was

going on, he supported what he says was

the same party, supported it upon a plat-

form hostile to that of the Northern De-

mocrat, and, after the rebellion is sup-

pressed, he turns upon the party which

he now seeks to revive, and which his de-

fection contributed ultimately to break up.—[Jour-

nal.]

What, in the deuce, does all that "he

supported," "same party, supported,"

"Northern Democracy, and supported,"

mean?—Democrat.

The Editor of the Democrat yesterday

contained an address from a committee of

the party.

The address simply one of our neigh-

bor's editorials with his name and four

or five other names added. It answers the

purpose very well; but, as we already

have over and over refuted everything in

it, we shall be pardoned if we reiterate

the performance at leisure.

This State has suffered by the late war,

but where would she have been if she had

The Journal says of its new party and

convention:

"It is true, the majority of the candi-

dates, like the majority of the party, ques-

tioned the policy of the war against the South-

ern people; but the question as to whether

such policy was right or wrong is now a

settled question, and is treated accordingly

by the party, which is organized and con-

trolled without the slightest reference to

that ghost of a point."

This, in fact, was a confession of all that

has been said of the 22d of February Con-

vention. The majority of the convention

and of the candidates are declared to

question the right of the Government to

defend its life.—Democrat.

Neighbor, this is your gloss, not our

text. We declared no such thing.

Questioning the policy of war to preserve

the "life of the Government" and ques-

tioning the right of the Government to

defend its life are two very different

things; and there was a time when the

Editor of the Democrat not only perceived

the difference, but, heedless of conse-

quences, acted upon it. And, reader,

when do you suppose that time was? In

the height of the rebellion. And with whom

do you suppose he acted? With the men

who now denounce as rebels for the

action in which he then united. It is

even so.

In the crisis of the rebellion, the

Editor of the Democrat acted with these

selfsame men in opposition to the war;

but, after the rebellion is suppressed, he

turns upon them, and, adopting the cant

as well as the sentiment of the radical

party, charges his old associates with

questioning "the right of the Government

to defend its life." Whatever may be

thought of his patriotism, none can deny

the genuineness of his assurance.

We, indeed, do not see how the Editor of

the Democrat can oppose it even "with

self-respect," for, while the rebellion was

going on, he supported what he says was

